

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending. Claims 1-3, 26-28 and 48 are amended herein.

102 Rejections

Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobodzinski et al. ("Lobodzinski," US 5,734,873). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-54 is not anticipated or shown by Lobodzinski.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "a graphics controller coupled to the first memory, the graphics controller accessing a font array included in the data structure, the graphics controller comprising a second memory for holding information read from the font array" as recited in independent Claim 1 (emphasis added). In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest "placing the information read from the font array in a second memory resident on a graphics controller" as recited in independent Claim 26 (emphasis added). Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest a system "wherein glyph information for a character to be rendered, said size width information and said size height information are read to registers that reside on said graphics controller from said data structure" as recited in independent Claim 48 (emphasis added).

The Examiner is directed to Figure 2 of Lobodzinski and the accompanying discussion. Applicant respectfully notes that there is no showing or suggestion in Lobodzinski that graphics engine 48 places information read from character font

information 62 into memory resident on the graphics engine 48. Lobodzinski only describes registers 46 that are not resident on the graphics engine.

The Examiner attempts to equate the graphics controller of the claimed invention to the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski. Applicant respectfully notes that if the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski is interpreted as the graphics controller of the claimed invention, then the limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48 are not shown or suggested by Lobodzinski. As mentioned above, Lobodzinski does not show or suggest memory resident on a graphics controller (when the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski is interpreted as the graphics controller). The Examiner makes reference to statements in Lobodzinski that describe registers associated with the text engine 52 of Lobodzinski. For example, column 4, lines 30-32, of Lobodzinski states "Registers associated with the text engine are described below." However, there is no showing or suggestion that any of these registers are resident on the graphics controller (when the graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski is interpreted as the graphics controller). The registers referred to by Lobodzinski can only be read as being the registers 46, which as mentioned above are not resident on the graphics engine 48.

In the Advisory Action mailed August 25, 2003, the Examiner responds to the above by stating that Lobodzinski teaches memory resident on a graphics controller. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that, in the above, the Examiner is interpreting graphics engine 48 of Lobodzinski as the claimed graphics controller. There is no memory resident on graphics engine 48. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Applicant's arguments

considering the Examiner's interpretation of graphics engine 48 as the claimed graphics controller.

As an alternative to the interpretation above, the Examiner attempts to equate the graphics controller of the claimed invention to the display controller 30 of Lobodzinski. The Applicant respectfully submits that such an interpretation is not proper, as follows. The display controller 30 of Lobodzinski is shown as including the frame buffer 56. However, the graphics controller of the claimed invention does not include a frame buffer. According to Claims 2, 27 and 49, the frame buffer is coupled to the graphics controller of the claimed invention. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the display controller 30 of Lobodzinski cannot be interpreted to be the claimed graphics controller, because the display controller of Lobodzinski includes a frame buffer while the claimed graphics controller does not.

In the Advisory Action mailed August 25, 2003, the Examiner responds to the above by stating, in essence, that the display controller 30 of Lobodzinski includes a frame buffer that in turn includes a character font information memory 62 and a string information memory 64. As presented above, Applicants respectfully reiterate that the claimed graphics controller does not include a frame buffer. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully respond that neither the frame buffer, the character font information memory, nor the string information memory of Lobodzinski is for holding information read from the font array. Applicants respectfully note that the memory recited by the claims is in addition to a frame buffer, and respectfully assert that no such memory is shown or suggested by Lobodzinski. Looking at Claim 1, for example, the memories cited by

the Examiner correspond to the "first memory" recited in the claim. However, the first memory does not reside on the claimed graphics controller. The memories cited by the Examiner do not show or suggest the "second memory for holding information read from the font array."

The Examiner also attempts to equate the font array of the claims with the array of index 412, font pointer 414, font pitch 415, x 416, y 418, size width 420 and size height 421 of Figure 4 of the instant application. Applicant respectfully notes that the font array recited in the claims is specifically "a font array included in the data structure." A "font array included in the data structure" includes font arrays 460 and 462 of Figure 4 of the instant application, not index 412, font pointer 414, font pitch 415, x 416, y 418, size width 420 and size height 421. Applicants respectfully note that the phrase "font array included in the data structure" is to be read in its entirety. Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement that "this array is resident on the graphics engine 48" of Lobodzinski. As mentioned above, Lobodzinski does not show or suggest memory resident on the graphics engine 48.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's basis for rejection of Claims 1, 26 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed, and that Claims 1, 26 and 48 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-25 are dependent on Claim 1; Claims 27-47 are dependent on Claim 26; and Claims 49-54 are dependent on Claim 48. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner's

basis for rejection of Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is also traversed, as Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-54 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Date: 10/6/03

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060